

Appl. No. 10/037,707
Amdt. Dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

REMARKS

There are 30 originally filed claims in the present application. Claims 1-4, 15-18, and 26-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 5, 6, and 10-14 have been amended to distinctively and particularly claim the invention disclosed in the present application. The amendments are supported by the originally filed claims, Page 8 lines 20-27, Page 8, line 30 to page 9, line 4, and Page 9, lines 23-29. No new matter has been introduced. Therefore, there are 17 claims pending in the present application.

Claims 1-2, 6-15 and 19-30 as originally filed have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. 6,586,925 to Ramesh *et al.* (Ramesh '925). Claims 1-2 have been cancelled. Claims 6-13 are dependent upon the newly amended claim 5. Because the originally filed claim 5 is not anticipated, the newly amended claim 5 shall not be anticipated so that claims 6-13 are not anticipated. Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the features in originally filed claims 15-18. Because the originally filed claims 16-18 are not anticipated, the newly amended claim 14 shall not be anticipated. Claim 15 has

Appl. No. 10/037,707
Amdt. Dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

been cancelled. Claims 19-25 are dependent upon the newly amended claim 14 so that claims 19-25 are not anticipated. Claims 26-30 have been cancelled. Therefore, the remaining claims 5-14, and 19-25 are not anticipated by Ramesh '925.

Claims 3-5 and 16-18 as originally filed have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramesh '925. In particular, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have tapered section Ramesh et al to be a non-sloping edge since the shape of the edge would provide support in a selective manner to each individual user moving the handler plate within the tester plate. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

The claimed invention in the present application as represented by the newly amended claim 5 is directed to a docking system that can be operated both manually and automatically. As explained in our last response, manual movement of the cam handle enables the escalating slot to gradually engage the lateral protrusion along the linear sloping edge of the tapered section until the lateral

Appl. No. 10/037,707
Amdt. Dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 29, 2004

protrusion is positioned at the docking section. In an automatic operation of the docking system, the escalating slot allows two linear movements, one from the unbounded perimeter portion to the linear non-sloping edge, and the other along the linear non-sloping edge to the linear docking edge of the docking section. This is one of the features of the present invention that is neither taught nor suggested by Ramesh '925. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-14, and 19-25 are not anticipated by or made unpatentable in view of Ramesh '925.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,


LAWRENCE N. GINSBERG,

1/28/05

DATE

Attorney for Applicant, Reg. No. 30,943 Customer No. 35,830

21 San Antonio
Newport Beach, CA 92660-9112
Tel. - 949-640-6261